

Memorandum for Record

Subject: Project Coordination Team (PCT) Meeting for John H. Kerr Section 216, Neuse River Basin, Princeville, and Currituck Sound Feasibility Studies

The subject meeting took place in the Wilmington District Office in the Main Conference Room on 25 November 2002 from at 1000 to 1450. Enclosure 1 is a copy of the agenda and page 2 of the agenda includes a list of attendees.

1. Welcome and General Comments.

- a. Col. Alexander welcomed all meeting participants and expressed his appreciation for their involvement in the John H. Kerr Section 216, Neuse River Basin, Princeville, and Currituck Sound Feasibility Studies.
- b. Mr. John Morris discussed the complexity of the Currituck and John H. Kerr 216 Studies and expressed his enthusiasm for beginning the feasibility phases for these studies.

2. John H. Kerr 216 Study.

- a. Ms. Lisa Hetherman provided a project update for the John H. Kerr 216 Study. She stated that since the last PCT meeting, the three phase approach for the study was accepted and defined. The phase 2 and phase 3 tasks were removed from the Draft Project Management Plan (PMP) and the costs for the tasks in phase 1 were re-evaluated several times to lower the cost estimates. Also, comments on the Draft PMP that Mr. Jim Mead provided at the last meeting were addressed.
- b. Mr. Ray Batchelor presented information on the LIDAR mapping timing and funding. The State of North Carolina will be flying near the Roanoke River Basin this winter and by requesting their help with data collection for the area in Virginia, north of the state line, the costs would be less than if we paid for a separate fly over at a different time. However, the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement will not be approved and signed in time to fund the fly over.

Discussion on this topic was as follows: Cost would be \$192,000 for data collection and processing or \$62,000 for just data collection. Mr. Sam Pearsall mentioned that The Nature Conservancy (TNC) has a lab at Duke and the researchers there have ways to process the data. The cost for just the equipment for a fly over is \$20,000 and the data collection costs are less expensive for larger areas. For the modeling which is thought to be necessary between Kerr and Gaston it will be \$60,000 to \$100,000 just for the ground surveys if we wait to do the flyover. Mr. Ron Fascher mentioned that it is better to have data from one source. Currently it is

believed that no topographic survey data for the Roanoke Basin area in Virginia, north of the state line exists. Mr. David Paylor mentioned that he would like to wait and determine what data Virginia has. During discussion, Mr. Jim Mead stated that the data from around the shoreline would be used to determine land use and how water levels affect use of facilities. Mr. John Morris stated he would like to wait to see if changing the lake level is “in the cards” and then determine if the data is needed. The decision by those speaking at this meeting was to wait until Task 1.A.3 (Determine Availability and Adequacy of Topographic Survey Data) is completed to decide if the fly over is needed.

- c. Discussion on the Draft PMP: Mr. Morris provided Ms. Hetherman with Mr. Pearsall’s comments on the Draft PMP. Mr. Paylor indicated that he would get comments to Ms. Hetherman the following week. Mr. Morris provided a hand out titled: Kerr Lake Section 216 Study Coordination Procedures. He stated the PMP is now an adequate basis for signing the cost sharing agreement and work groups can convene to improve the PMP.

Mr. Paylor suggested describing the deliverable for each item right before the total costs at the end of each Scope of Work for each item. He also suggested that the PMP list the total length of time it takes to complete a task, not just man days (running timeline). Ms. Caroline Struthers mentioned that phase 2 and 3 should be described in more detail and how the work groups are funded should be addressed. Mr. Morris and Mr. Paylor agreed that the working groups will contribute to the end product, but will not enter into costs for cost sharing.

Mr. Pearsall suggested that a consultant be used in phase 1 to develop the Scope of Work for the sedimentation tasks. He suggested Phil Townsend from the Appalachian Lab. at the University of Maryland in Frostburg.

Mr. Morris stated that he would like to have details documented on communications and how agreements will be reached like Wilmington Harbor has. Col. Alexander stated if deviating from the model FCSA would not cause a huge delay, then the need for communication prior to implementation of elements should be listed in the FCSA and the Wilmington Harbor Operating Procedures document should be used as an example. Mr. Morris mentioned that a side agreement with working relationships described would work better than including the communicating procedures in the FCSA. Mr. Paylor stated that excess study costs should be handled up front and general wording, like the Wilmington Harbor example will work well. It was agreed that the wording on communication will be in the PMP. Mr. Paylor stated that he would like to incorporate as much as possible in the FCSA.

Several participants mentioned how long it would take to get the FCSA approved by Headquarters' with deviations. They agreed it may take four months and that 6 to 8 weeks would be fast. Mr. Coleman Long mentioned that a Vertical Team Meeting should be set up to eliminate documents being sent back and forth. Col. Alexander stated that the Vertical Team will work together on a draft FCSA and be ready to begin feasibility work on 1 February 2003. Ms. Struthers agreed to have a working draft FCSA prepared by Christmas and stated she will advise on the best approach for sending to HDQ.

- d. The division of costs between the two cost sharing partners for the FCSA was discussed. Discussion occurred on the need for percentages of costs each state will pay. Mr. Paylor agreed that Virginia would cover half (25% or costs) the sponsors' costs for PMP items 5, 9, 10, and 11. Also, Virginia will fund fifteen percent of the costs for items 1 and 2.

Mr. Steve Aiken stated that North Carolina can be held financially responsible and Virginia and North Carolina can have side agreements. Ms. Struthers stated Virginia could sign, but would not need to be held responsible for total sponsors' amount. Mr. Morris requested that the idea of North Carolina being ultimately responsible for funds in the FCSA be left "on the table". Mr. Paylor agreed that this idea could be considered. Mr. Long stated the FCSA can be amended later if the percentages need to be changed. Ms. Struthers mentioned that side agreements may prevent the need for amendments. Mr. Aiken mentioned that until the FCSA is amended the way the percentages are listed is how funds come to us.

Mr. Aiken explained how the Sponsors get credit for work-in-kind. A letter of request is sent which includes the hours worked times the hourly rate with overhead, administration, and travel costs included.

Mr. Aiken stated that if we cannot get the funds expected for one year, it will not jeopardize the study. Mr. Pearsall mentioned that the work groups will continue without funds. Mr. Morris and Mr. Aiken agreed that the States can get ahead with funds and work in kind while the USACE catches up, but not vice versa. Mr. Morris mentioned that he believes the State can get started soon with the water quality element.

Mr. Wayne Bissette suggested that a contingency greater than the typical 25% be used to cover extra costs since with this study there is much uncertainty.

- e-f. It was decided that the questions on how to review and modify work items with work groups, how the Executive Committee will approve items for funding after revision, and how to determine best agency or contractor for

work items, would be answered by the work groups during the feasibility phase.

- g. There was discussion on the proper process for submitting the Sustainable Rivers Quarterly Report. The USACE Headquarters' staff requested a quarterly report on 14 November and there were only 3 working days for the Wilmington USACE Point of Contact (POC) to work with TNC's POC. This was the first time a report like this was put together. It was agreed that now that there is a format, the USACE and TNC will work together on the report ahead of the due date. The next due date will be in mid-January. It was decided that Mr. Pearsall will be TNC's POC and will come to Wilmington to help write the report with Ms. Noel Clay who will be the USACE POC. Ms. Clay will schedule the meetings.

3. Neuse River Study.

Mr. Al Bjorkquist provided copies of the Draft Fiscal Year 2003 Plan and provided a project update. Several field trips have been made since the last PCT meeting to evaluate potential sites for Continuing Authorities Program, Aquatic Restoration (Section 206) projects. One of the sites that appears to fit the Section 206 authority best is at Gum Thicket Creek, which is located near the mouth of the Neuse River. Primary nursery areas near the mouth of the creek are in danger due to erosion. A study at that site will likely proceed. Additional potential Section 206 sites will be evaluated as part of the Neuse River Basin Study. Funds in the amount of \$170,000 are projected to be needed for Fiscal Year 2003 for the Neuse River Study as shown in the Draft Fiscal Year 2003 Plan.

4. Princeville Study.

Mr. Al Bjorkquist provided copies of the Draft Fiscal Year 2003 Plan and provided a project update. Mr. Bjorkquist indicated that recent backwater calculations done by the State of North Carolina (by consultant) at Princeville show that the upstream tie-in of the existing Corps levee may not be at the level of the 100-year flood profile. This may make economic justification of improvements for flood control more likely. Funds in the amount of \$564,000 are needed in Fiscal Year 2003 for the Princeville Study as shown on the Draft Fiscal Year 2003 Plan.

5. Currituck Sound Study.

Ms. Lisa Hetherman provided copies of the Draft PMP for the Currituck Sound Study. Ms. Hetherman mentioned that since the last PCT meeting the three phase approach was accepted for the Currituck Study and a Draft PMP was written following the same format as the 216 PMP. Then the Draft PMP topic areas were refined, more tasks added and associated costs

for phase 1 included. Mr. Morris indicated he would review the Draft PMP and provide comments.

6. Tentative Date for Next PCT Meeting.

The tentative date selected for the next meeting was 14 February 2003. It was suggested that the meeting be held at John H. Kerr Dam or in Raleigh. Mr. Sam Pearsall offered to research how TNC would process LIDAR data and would like to demonstrate the process at the next PCT meeting.

Encl. Agenda and Attendees

**Project Coordination Team (PCT) Meeting
Agenda and Participant List
25 November 2002**

**Main Conference Room
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Wilmington District Office
10 am – 4 pm**

1. Welcome and General Comments
 - a. Col. Alexander
 - b. Executive Committee Members – Dave Paylor and John Morris
2. John H. Kerr 216 Study
 - a. Project Update
 - b. LIDAR Mapping Timing and Funding
 - c. Discussion on Project Management Plan
 - d. Division of Costs Between Two Cost Sharing Partners for the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement
 - e. Discussion on how to review and modify work items with work groups and how Executive Committee will approve items for funding after revision
 - f. Discussion on how to determine best agency or contractor for work items
 - g. Process for Submitting the Sustainable Rivers Quarterly Report
3. Neuse River Study
Project Update
4. Princeville Study
Project Update
5. Currituck Sound Study
 - a. Project Update
 - b. Discussion on Project Management Plan
6. Set Tentative Date for Next PCT Meeting

Note: Sandwiches and snacks for lunch will be provided.

PCT Meeting Participants

Steve Aiken, Programs, Chief, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wilmington District
(USACE - W)
Col. Charles Alexander, District Engineer, USACE - W
Ray Batchelor, Civil Engineer, Mapping Coordinator, USACE - W
Wayne Bissette, Engineering, Chief, USACE - W
Al Bjorkquist, Project Manager for Neuse River and Princeville Studies, USACE - W
Blair Boyd, Finance and Accounting, Chief, USACE - W
Noel Clay, Lead Planner for the Neuse River and John H. Kerr 216 Studies, USACE - W
Ron Fascher, Planning Services, Chief, USACE - W
Doug Greene, Lead Planner for the Princeville Study, USACE - W
Lisa Hetherman, Project Manager for the John H. Kerr 216 and Currituck Sound Studies,
USACE - W
Coleman Long, Project Management, Chief, USACE - W
Jim Mead, Division of Water Resources, North Carolina Department of Environment and
Natural Resources (DENR)
John Morris, Director, Division of Water Resources, North Carolina DENR
David Paylor, Deputy Secretary, Commonwealth of Virginia Department of Natural
Resources
Sam Pearsall, PhD, Director of Science and Stewardship, The Nature Conservancy
Caroline Struthers, Lawyer for the John H. Kerr 216 Study, USACE - W
Eugene Tickner, Deputy District Engineer, USACE - W
Ben Wood, Technical Services Division, Chief, USACE - W